JUN-19-2012 19:35

Document 9 Filed Ub/20/12 U.S. Department of Justice

United States Attorney Southern District of New York

86 Chambers Street New York, New York 10007

June 19, 2012

Application Granted/Denied So Ordered.

P.02

BY FACSIMILE: (914) 390-4278

Honorable Cathy Seibel United States District Court Southern District of New York 300 Quarropas Street, Room 275 White Plains, New York 10601-4150

Re:

Kelly, et al. v. U.S. Dep't of Veterans Affairs, et al.,

12 Civ. 587 (CS)

Dear Judge Seibel:

G/13/12 order is Vacated. The case is distrissed without prejudice + shall rema

I am the Assistant United States Attorney assigned to represent the interests of the United States Department of Veterans Affairs ("VA") and the following VA officers and employees in their official capacities (collectively "VA Defendants") in the above-referenced action: Eric K. Shinseki, Secretary of the VA; Aileen Hilliard; Nelander Alcindor; Cindy Eastwood; Marilyn Firestone; Kathleen Merando-Barker; Patricia Burke; James Joos; Catherine Napoli; Lude Belony; Marcia Ralph; Mary Stevenson; Tonya Bello Opusunju; and Joanne Callanan. On behalf of the parties, I write to respectfully advise the Court that its June 13, 2012 Order ("Order") [Dkt. No. 8] appears to conflict with a Stipulation of Voluntary Dismissal ("Stipulation") filed by the parties on June 12, 2012 [Dkt. No. 7]. A copy of the Stipulation is attached for Your Honor's reference.

On June 12, 2012, the parties filed the fully-executed Stipulation pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(a)(1)(A), which allows an action to be dismissed without a court order through the filing of "a notice of dismissal before the opposing party serves either an answer or a motion for summary judgment." Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(a)(1)(A). Paragraph 1 of the Stipulation provided that the action was to be dismissed "without prejudice." See Dkt. No. 7 at ¶ 1; see also Fed. R. Civ. P. 14(a)(1)(B) ("Unless the notice or stipulation states otherwise, the dismissal is without prejudice."). At the time the Stipulation was filed, the VA Defendants had not agreed to settle this action in exchange for a release of plaintiffs' claims. Rather, the Stipulation was filed, in part, because plaintiffs acknowledged that their claims needed to be administratively exhausted first, before they could file suit in federal court.

On June 13, 2012, however, this Court filed the Order, which stated that the parties had "reported to this Court that this case has been settled," and directed that "this action [be]

Although the complaint also names defendants Maureen Schriber and Angela Wallace, this Office does not represent their interests because the VA has no record that either person was ever employed with the agency,

Honorable Cathy Seibel June 19, 2012

Page 2

discontinued with prejudice . . . ." See Dkt. No. 8 at 1 (emphasis added). The Order further provides that the case may be reopened by application by either party "if settlement is not consummated within thirty days of the date of this order." Id.

Accordingly, the Court's Order appears to conflict with the Stipulation, given that the parties have neither negotiated nor reached any agreement in principle to settle this case, the "[f]iling of a notice of voluntary dismissal with the court automatically terminates the action as to the defendants who are the subjects of the notice," Concha v. London, 62 F.3d 1493, 1509 (9th Cir. 1995), and the terms of the Stipulation and Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(a)(1)(B) support dismissing this action without prejudice. The parties therefore respectfully request that the Order be amended to reflect the parties' intent to voluntarily withdraw this action without prejudice, and to permit this case to terminate as of the date of the Stipulation, without requiring the submission of a settlement agreement or conferring any rights to re-open.

We respectfully request that this letter be docketed, and thank the Court for its consideration of this request.

Respectfully,

PREET BHARARA
United States Attorney

By:

TOMOKO ONOZAWA

Assistant United States Aftorney

Tel: (212) 637-2721 Fax: (212) 637-2686

Email: tomoko.onozawa@usdoj.gov

cc: Damond Carter, Esq. (via electronic mail, w/o enclosure)

| UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT        |     |
|-------------------------------------|-----|
| FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YO | ORK |

MATTIE KELLY, ELNORE CUSHNIE, and VELMA PATTERSON-BROOKS, as well as all other similarly situated persons,

**ECF CASE** 

Plaintiffs,

-Against-

United States Department of Veterans Affairs, Eric K. Shinseki, Secretary of U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, Aillee N. Hillar d, Nelander Alcindor, Cindy Eastwood, Maureen Schrib er, Marilyn Firestone, Kathleen Merando-Barker, Patr icia Burke, James Joos, Catherine Napoli, Lude Be llamy, Marcia Ralph, Mary Stevenson, Angela Wallace, Tonya Bello Opusunju, and Joanne Callanan,

INDEX NO: 12-CV-0587(CS) P.04

STIPULATION OF VOLUNTARY DISMISSAL

Defendants.

------X

WHEREAS, on January 24, 2012, Plaintiffs Matt ie Kelly, Elnore Cushnie, and Velma Patterson-Brooks ("Plaintiffs") filed a complaint (the "Complaint") asserting claims under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act ("ADEA"), 29 U.S.C. §§ 623(a)(1) and (2), and the Federal Tort Claims Act ("FTCA"), 28 U.S.C. § 1346(b), against defendant United States Department of Veterans Affairs, and defendants Eric K. Shinseki, Ailee n Hilliard, Nelander Alcindor, Cindy Eastwood, Marilyn Firestone, Kathleen Merando-Barker, Patricia Burke, James Joos, Catherine Napoli, Lude Belony, Marcia Ralph, Mary Stevenson, Tonya Bello Opusunju, and Joanne Callanan in their official capacities (collectively, the "VA Defendants"); and

WHEREAS, the Com plaint also named as de fendants Maurcen Schriber and Angela Wallace, who have not appeared in this action;

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED, by and between the attorneys for Plaintiffs and the VA Defendants, as follows:

- 1. Pursuant to Rule 41(a)(1)(A) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, this action is dismissed without prejudice.
- 2. The parties understand and agree that this Stipulation and Order contains the entire agreement between them, and that no statements, representations, promises, agreements, or negotiations, oral or otherwise, between the parties or their counsel that are not included herein shall be of any force or effect.
- 3. This Stipulation may be executed in counterparts. Facsimile signatures shall constitute originals.

Dated: New York, New York

June 12, 2012

CARTER & ASSOCIATE

ATTORNEYS - RLLC
Attorney for Habitiffs

By:

amond J. Carter, Esq.

369 Lexington Avenue, 2nd Floor New York, New York 10017

Telephone: (646) 308-1279 Facsimile: (888) 711-4420

Email: damcart@carter-attornevs.com

Dated:

New York, New York

June /2, 2012

PREET BHARARA
United States Atlorney

Attorney for the VA Defendants

3y: ( )

TOMOKO ONOZAWA

Assistant United States Attorney 86 Chambers Street, 3rd Floor New York, New York 10007 Telephone: (212) 637-2721

Facsimile: (212) 637-2721 Facsimile: (212) 637-2686

Email: tomoko.onozawa@usdoj.gov



## **FACSIMILE COVER SHEET**

U.S. ATTORNEY'S OFFICE- SDNY 86 CHAMBERS STREET NEW YORK, NY 10007

From: Tomoko Onozawa

Assistant United States Attorney

Office Phone No.: (212) 637-2721

Fax Number: (212) 637-2686

No. pages (including cover sheet): 5

Date sent: June 19, 2012

## "FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY" U.S. ATTORNEY FACSIMILE COMMUNICATION

The information contained in this facsimile message, and any and all accompanying documents, constitute "FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY" information. This information is the property of the U.S. Attorney's Office. If you are not the intended recipient of this information, any disclosure, copying, distribution, or the taking of any action in reliance on this information is strictly prohibited. If you received this information in error, please notify us immediately by telephone at the above number and destroy the information. (rev. 9/08)

To: Chambers of the Honorable Cathy Seibel

Fax No. (914) 390-4278

Cc: Damond Carter, Esq.

Counsel for Plaintiff

Via email: damcart@carter-attorneys.com; damcart@hotmail.com

Re: Kelly v. U.S. Dep't of Veterans Affairs, 12 Civ. 587 (CS)

Note: Please see the attached letter from counsel for the VA Defendants.